

Will We Discover Exotic Physics and Emergent Phenomena in the "Noise and Artifacts" of Quantum Computers?

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

April 5, 2025

Quantum computers are typically evaluated by how well they approximate idealized behavior—perfect gates, coherent qubits, and minimal error. Within this framework, noise is viewed as a barrier: something to suppress, correct, or avoid. But what if that noise isn't just error? What if it contains structure, patterns, or correlations that hint at something deeper? This paper explores the hypothesis that quantum noise, particularly in today's noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) devices, might harbor early signs of exotic physics or emergent phenomena. These systems operate under conditions known to produce complex behavior in other domains—nonlinearity, many-body interaction, feedback, and far-from-equilibrium dynamics. Instead of treating noise as a failure of control, we propose examining it as a potential medium for discovery. Drawing on ideas from statistical physics, complexity theory, and quantum information science, we outline both theoretical motivations and practical methodologies for identifying possible emergent behavior in quantum systems. We also survey existing experimental work—on thermalization, reservoir computing, and analog quantum devices—that may already be producing early signals. If this hypothesis holds, the next major advance in quantum physics may not require new machines. It may be hidden in the noise of the ones we've already built.

Keywords: quantum computing, quantum noise, emergence, complex systems, decoherence, entanglement, quantum thermodynamics, machine learning, quantum information, spontaneous structure, NISQ, quantum chaos, reservoir computing, many-body physics, nonlinear dynamics, quantum hardware, experimental physics, open quantum systems, quantum phase transitions, self-organization. A collaboration with GPT-4o. CC4.0.

1. Introduction

Quantum computing has, from the beginning, pursued a clean goal: idealized control of isolated quantum systems. The underlying assumption has been that if we can minimize all sources of noise, decoherence, and unwanted interaction, then we can build reliable quantum logic gates, stack them into algorithms, and execute computations that are intractable on classical hardware. That goal remains important, and the bulk of research has followed this path. Noise is treated as an engineering problem—something to suppress, compensate for, or work around using error correction and improved hardware design.

But what if noise is not just a problem to be eliminated? What if some portion of the noise—especially in large, entangled, imperfect systems—is not noise at all, but evidence of something else? This paper explores the idea that the artifacts and fluctuations present in today’s quantum devices might carry within them traces of emergent physical behavior that we don’t yet understand. Instead of being simple error, the irregularities might be signs of underlying structure—structure that has not been intentionally engineered, but that arises from the complexity of the system itself.

This hypothesis runs counter to the reductionist framework that dominates quantum computing. In the reductionist view, the machine is a collection of qubits, gates, and control lines. Each element has a defined role, and any deviation from that role is considered noise. Emergence takes a different view. It holds that new patterns and behaviors can arise from the collective interaction of many parts, especially under conditions where coherence, feedback, and complexity coexist. These behaviors can’t be reduced to the sum of the components—they are properties of the whole.

Physics has already seen this happen. In many-body systems, in condensed matter, and in biological systems, behaviors have emerged that were not visible at the level of the individual unit. In those cases, new models had to be developed to describe what the system was doing. The same might be true in quantum computing—not despite the noise, but because of it.

This paper proposes to treat quantum noise as a subject of study in its own right. It asks what kind of physics might be present in the irregularities of real devices. It outlines the conditions under which emergent behavior might appear, surveys the limited experimental data we already have, and suggests methods for looking more closely. The goal is not to challenge the value of ideal quantum computing, but to consider that something else might be happening in parallel—and that we might already have the tools to detect it.

2. Understanding Quantum Noise

Quantum noise refers to the deviations from ideal behavior that occur when a quantum system interacts with its environment, with other parts of itself, or with imperfect control signals. It is not a single phenomenon, but a category of effects that disrupt coherence, introduce uncertainty, and degrade computational accuracy. While some forms of noise can be modeled as random, many are structured, repeatable, and rooted in the physical and informational complexity of the system. Understanding quantum noise is essential not just for improving quantum computation, but for asking whether something deeper might be hidden within it.

One of the most well-known and widely studied forms of quantum noise is decoherence. In ideal quantum computing, qubits exist in superposition, maintaining well-defined phase relationships that are essential for interference-based algorithms. Decoherence occurs when a qubit becomes entangled with its surrounding environment—thermal fluctuations, electromagnetic fields, mechanical vibrations—causing its phase information to leak into degrees of freedom that are not being measured or controlled. As a result, the qubit's state appears to collapse into classical probability distributions. This process is generally irreversible on operational timescales and is often modeled as a Markovian loss of coherence.

Another common source of noise is crosstalk, which arises when control signals or the state of one qubit unintentionally influence nearby qubits. This can occur

through shared control lines, electromagnetic coupling, or mechanical proximity in chip-based systems. Crosstalk is often a form of coherent noise, meaning it is not random but instead follows systematic patterns. It creates complex, often nonlocal correlations between qubits, making errors harder to isolate and correct. Because crosstalk operates through the same physical channels used for computation, it can mimic intended behavior while subtly altering the outcome.

A subtler and less well-characterized phenomenon involves entanglement fluctuations. In small, controlled systems, entanglement is managed intentionally, with gate sequences creating predictable correlations between qubits. But in larger systems, especially those operating near the limits of control, entanglement can spread unintentionally. These fluctuations are not merely errors—they may represent transient structures forming within the quantum state. They vary over time and across runs, and while they may degrade fidelity from a computational standpoint, they may also encode emergent patterns that are not yet fully understood.

Quantum noise is often divided into two general categories: coherent and incoherent. Coherent noise refers to systematic, phase-preserving errors that stem from imperfect control, such as miscalibrated gates or frequency drift. These errors are not truly random and often accumulate in ways that reflect the underlying physical structure of the device. Incoherent noise, by contrast, includes stochastic processes such as spontaneous emission, thermal relaxation, and environmental coupling that introduce random fluctuations and result in a net loss of quantum information.

The behavior of quantum noise is shaped by the architecture and scale of the system. In small systems with few qubits, noise can often be mapped and corrected using well-established techniques. As systems scale up, however, noise becomes less uniform and more difficult to isolate. In this regime, it is possible that noise ceases to behave like mere error and begins to act like a complex system in its own right. The question then arises: is quantum noise just structured randomness, a complicated but ultimately reducible tangle of effects? Or is it an instance of genuine complexity, where the interactions between noise sources,

control systems, and entangled qubits generate emergent behaviors that are qualitatively new?

This question cannot be answered from first principles alone. It demands direct investigation. If emergent phenomena are present within the noise, they will not appear as clean, isolated signatures. They will show up in correlations, in statistical outliers, in unexpected stability under certain conditions. But to see these, researchers must begin looking at quantum noise not as background to subtract, but as a possible signal in its own right.

3. Historical Lessons: Noise as the Starting Point for Discovery

Throughout the history of physics, some of the most profound discoveries have come not from clean, predictable signals, but from data that initially appeared messy, inconsistent, or even mistaken. What was first dismissed as noise, background error, or unexplained variation later turned out to be the early signature of something fundamentally new. These episodes provide clear precedent for taking a second look at anomalies, especially in complex systems where underlying patterns may be deeply hidden beneath surface irregularities.

One of the most well-known examples is the discovery of superconductivity. In 1911, Heike Kamerlingh Onnes was studying the electrical resistance of metals at low temperatures. His experiments with mercury revealed a sudden and complete disappearance of resistance near 4.2 Kelvin. At first, this seemed improbable—possibly a measurement error or an artifact of the experimental setup. The idea that a material could conduct electricity with zero resistance defied both classical expectations and the known behavior of electrons in solids. But further repetition confirmed the result. What appeared to be an irregularity turned out to mark a new phase of matter, characterized by macroscopic quantum coherence. The phenomenon of superconductivity, initially indistinguishable from a strange noise pattern, became one of the foundational discoveries in condensed matter physics.

The quantum Hall effect, discovered in 1980 by Klaus von Klitzing, followed a similar path. While measuring the conductivity of a two-dimensional electron gas

under low temperature and strong magnetic fields, his team observed plateaus in the Hall resistance—flat regions where the value remained constant despite changes in magnetic field. At first, these plateaus seemed like an artifact or anomaly. The quantized values were too precise, too clean, and too resistant to perturbation to fit into known theories of electron transport. But the effect was real, and eventually understood as evidence for topologically protected edge states—a fundamentally new kind of order in quantum systems. Again, what at first seemed like a deviation or imperfection turned out to be the signal of something profound.

In a different domain, the early study of deterministic chaos also emerged from noise. Researchers attempting to model weather, fluid flow, and planetary orbits found systems that behaved erratically even under simple rules. Edward Lorenz, in the 1960s, discovered that small changes in initial conditions led to dramatically different outcomes in simulations of atmospheric convection. The irregular behavior at first resembled noise or instability. But further work showed that the apparent randomness was governed by underlying structure—strange attractors and fractal geometries. What seemed like computational instability was actually the fingerprint of chaotic dynamics. This led to the development of chaos theory, a framework that has reshaped how scientists understand everything from biology to economics.

These historical cases share a common thread: the tendency of observers—especially when grounded in a reductionist framework—to dismiss anomalous data as error, and only later to realize that these deviations carried essential information about previously unknown phenomena. In each case, the shift came not from better instruments or cleaner experiments alone, but from a change in interpretation—from treating artifacts as mistakes to considering them as signals in need of explanation.

This is precisely the kind of shift now worth considering in quantum computing. The noise in current devices is complex, non-uniform, and sometimes stubbornly resistant to correction. While much of it can be explained in terms of known decoherence mechanisms, some of it may reflect deeper dynamics within the

entangled, many-body systems that quantum computers are beginning to explore. If history is a guide, the first signs of emergent quantum behavior may not appear as clean results, but as unexplained irregularities—patterns in the noise. Recognizing them will require not only precision but also openness to reinterpretation.

4. Conditions That Favor Emergent Behavior

Emergent behavior does not arise in isolation. It typically appears under specific physical and informational conditions—often when systems are large, nonlinear, and operating under constraints that prevent simple equilibrium behavior. While the term “emergence” can carry different meanings in different contexts, it generally refers to collective behavior that is not predictable by analyzing components in isolation. In physics, emergence is often associated with the appearance of new macroscopic properties that are not evident at the microscopic level. Understanding the conditions under which such behavior can arise is key to evaluating whether quantum computers—especially in their noisy, imperfect states—might be capable of hosting emergent phenomena.

One of the clearest preconditions for emergence is nonlinearity. In linear systems, the response of the system is proportional to the input, and subsystems can be studied independently. Emergence, by contrast, often occurs when interactions are nonlinear—when the presence or state of one part of the system changes how other parts behave. In quantum systems, nonlinearity arises naturally in the dynamics of entangled particles and in the way quantum gates act on superposition states. As systems grow in size and complexity, these nonlinear interactions can produce feedback loops, resonances, or interference effects that are difficult to isolate or predict. In such systems, small fluctuations can have large, system-wide consequences, setting the stage for emergent behavior.

Another key condition is many-body interaction. Emergent phenomena typically arise when a large number of elements—atoms, qubits, agents—are interacting simultaneously. These interactions may be weak or strong, but their collective

effect often cannot be understood by extrapolating from small systems. In quantum computers with 50 or more qubits, the total Hilbert space becomes enormous, and the number of possible interaction pathways scales exponentially. Even modest levels of crosstalk or unintended coupling can create many-body effects, especially when qubits are entangled in depth or over time. These complex internal correlations may allow for the spontaneous formation of higher-level structure, particularly in systems that are not fully isolated from their environment.

Far-from-equilibrium dynamics are also a hallmark of emergent systems. At thermal equilibrium, systems tend to settle into predictable states governed by statistical mechanics. But many of the most interesting physical phenomena—pattern formation, phase transitions, turbulence, and biological self-organization—occur far from equilibrium, where energy is flowing through the system and internal dynamics are constantly adjusting. Quantum computers operate in a regime that is inherently far from equilibrium. Qubits are continuously driven by control pulses, reset operations, and measurement cycles, while simultaneously being subject to environmental decoherence. This combination of drive and dissipation places the system in a dynamic regime where steady-state behavior may be highly nontrivial—and potentially capable of generating emergent structure.

A uniquely quantum ingredient is entanglement, which creates nonlocal correlations between parts of the system. Entanglement is not just a resource for quantum computing—it is also a channel through which complexity can spread. In a highly entangled system, a change in one qubit can influence the entire state vector, even without direct interaction. As entanglement grows and fluctuates in the presence of noise, the system can move into configurations that are difficult to describe or predict using classical intuition. In some cases, the spread of entanglement has been found to follow universal patterns associated with phase transitions and thermalization. It is possible that under certain noise-driven conditions, quantum computers might spontaneously enter regimes where entanglement itself organizes into nontrivial patterns or exhibits long-range structure.

These four conditions—nonlinearity, many-body interaction, far-from-equilibrium dynamics, and entanglement—are not exotic features of laboratory-built systems. They are present, in varying degrees, in every quantum computer currently in operation. While most research focuses on minimizing or isolating these effects to preserve ideal gate operations, the very properties that complicate precision computing may also enable unexpected forms of order to emerge.

The similarity to known conditions in classical complex systems is striking. In areas ranging from fluid dynamics to neuroscience, emergent behavior has been observed in systems that share these same ingredients: interacting units, nonlinear coupling, dynamic disequilibrium, and a capacity for long-range coordination. This suggests that quantum computers, particularly in noisy regimes, might already be passing through the right zones for emergence. The challenge now is not necessarily to build the conditions—but to recognize them, to study their behavior under noise, and to consider that what we currently call “instability” may, in some cases, be the beginning of something more organized.

5. Candidate Phenomena Hidden in Quantum Noise

If quantum noise is more than error—if it is, in part, the surface expression of deeper structure—then the next question is what kinds of behaviors might be emerging beneath it. While experimental evidence is still limited, there are several candidate phenomena, drawn from both theory and analogy, that may be hiding within the statistical irregularities of noisy quantum systems. These behaviors do not fit into the standard gate-based computational model, but they may nonetheless be physically real, and in some cases, discoverable with tools already available.

One possibility is quantum turbulence—a form of disorder that is structured, dynamic, and nontrivial. In classical systems, turbulence appears when fluid flow exceeds a critical threshold and becomes chaotic, yet remains governed by coherent structures such as vortices. In quantum systems, turbulence has been observed in superfluids and Bose-Einstein condensates, where quantized vortices

form and interact in complex, sometimes long-lived patterns. The analogy in quantum computers is not exact, but there may be equivalent structures in the space of entanglement and coherence, especially when many-body interactions and fluctuating control sequences create persistent nonlinearity. Such turbulence in the computational state space could manifest as non-Gaussian error statistics, persistent correlations across qubits, or anomalous energy distributions that resist dissipation.

A second candidate is nonlocal thermodynamic behavior. Classical thermodynamics is local in the sense that entropy production and energy transfer typically occur through direct contact or interaction. In entangled systems, however, thermodynamic quantities can behave in nonlocal ways. It is possible, for instance, for subsystems to appear more ordered after interacting with noisy environments, depending on their entangled correlations with other parts of the system. This has been explored in the context of Maxwell's demon-type thought experiments and in recent studies of quantum thermalization. Noisy quantum processors, especially when subject to periodic resets and global decoherence, might host these effects naturally. This could manifest as unexpected temperature gradients, apparent entropy reduction, or spontaneous reordering of subsystem states.

Another possibility is the spontaneous formation of structure within entanglement networks. As qubit arrays evolve, entanglement spreads through the system. In clean, controlled circuits, this spreading is intentional and guided by gate sequences. But in noisy systems, the evolution of entanglement may take on its own dynamics, particularly when driven by feedback between local decoherence and global coupling. It is conceivable that certain configurations of entanglement are more stable than others—not because they are engineered, but because they are statistically favored by the structure of the noise and the topology of the qubit array. If so, we might observe recurrent patterns in the system's entanglement structure, manifesting as stable clusters, metastable regions, or long-range correlations that appear without explicit instruction. These patterns could resemble emergent network behavior observed in other complex systems.

Finally, and most speculatively, there is the possibility of self-organizing or cognitive-like behavior. This does not imply consciousness or intentionality, but rather the appearance of structure that adapts, responds, or optimizes itself in response to environmental conditions. In classical systems, self-organizing criticality and neural-network-like dynamics have been observed in far-from-equilibrium, noise-driven environments. In quantum systems, similar conditions exist—nonlinearity, feedback, high-dimensional state space, and continual disturbance. A noisy quantum processor might, under the right conditions, settle into low-error configurations not because it was programmed to do so, but because the system dynamics favor such configurations statistically. If these tendencies are robust and reproducible, they could mark the beginning of quantum systems that "learn" or "adapt" in a purely physical sense.

None of these behaviors are yet confirmed in quantum computers. But each has theoretical grounding in known physics, and each could plausibly emerge under the conditions already present in today's devices. The challenge is not just to define these behaviors, but to design ways of detecting them, distinguishing them from error, and understanding whether they represent new physical regimes or simply underappreciated consequences of known noise models. Either outcome would be valuable—but the possibility that we are glimpsing new physics through the lens of noise makes the search all the more urgent.

6. Current Experimental Clues

Although the primary focus of quantum computing research has been on improving fidelity and minimizing error, there is a growing body of experimental work—some direct, some incidental—that hints at more complex dynamics playing out within noisy quantum systems. These findings, though often framed in the context of benchmarking, calibration, or performance assessment, may contain early signatures of emergent behavior. Whether these are merely side effects of hardware limitations or the first observable consequences of deeper quantum complexity remains an open question.

One of the clearest lines of evidence comes from recent studies of quantum thermalization in small, closed systems. Researchers have shown that even without an external thermal bath, a group of entangled qubits subject to random operations and decoherence can exhibit statistical behavior consistent with thermal equilibrium. This suggests that the system, through internal interactions and noise, is capable of redistributing energy and information in ways that mimic classical thermodynamic processes. Notably, this behavior arises without any intentional programming—thermalization emerges from the system’s natural evolution under imperfect conditions. In some experiments, local measurements reveal subsystems that appear thermalized, even though the global state remains pure—a hallmark of quantum statistical mechanics that supports the idea of emergent order under noise.

Another area of interest is quantum reservoir computing, which explicitly embraces noise and complexity as computational resources. In these experiments, noisy quantum circuits are used as untrained, high-dimensional dynamical systems. Classical or quantum input signals are fed into the system, which then evolves under noisy conditions, and outputs are extracted from simple measurements. Despite the absence of detailed control over the internal dynamics, such reservoirs can perform tasks like pattern recognition, time-series forecasting, and classification. These results imply that quantum systems with significant internal noise and entanglement may still carry out useful transformations on input data—suggesting that emergent dynamics are doing computational work, even in the absence of conventional logic gates.

Analog quantum devices—especially those designed for optimization tasks—also show signs of unexplained structure arising during noisy operation. For example, D-Wave’s quantum annealers, which operate through the slow evolution of an energy landscape in the presence of thermal and quantum noise, have sometimes produced solutions that appear more consistent or structured than expected, given the level of decoherence involved. In studies comparing annealing results across different problem embeddings, researchers have found recurrent solution clusters and stability patterns that suggest nontrivial correlations. While these are often explained in terms of energy minima and problem geometry, it remains

possible that aspects of the solution dynamics are emergent—driven by noise-induced self-organization rather than solely by the Hamiltonian's explicit form.

In superconducting qubit arrays, particularly those with nearest-neighbor connectivity and modest qubit counts (10–50), there have been reports of anomalous correlations that persist across multiple runs, even when initial conditions and control sequences vary. Some of these effects have been attributed to crosstalk, calibration drift, or correlated errors. But others resist easy classification and appear to involve feedback between decoherence and internal entanglement spreading. These patterns are often treated as engineering challenges—but they may also be early indicators of emergent coherence, metastable entangled structures, or noise-mediated symmetry breaking.

While none of these findings provide definitive proof of emergence, they form a pattern: noisy quantum systems often behave in ways that are more structured, more stable, or more computationally useful than simple models would predict. These outcomes could be dismissed as artifacts of particular hardware setups or edge-case behaviors. But they could also be early evidence that quantum systems, when sufficiently complex and imperfect, begin to express new forms of order.

The key question is how we interpret these clues. If we continue to view noise strictly as an obstacle, these behaviors will remain hidden behind calibration curves and error models. If we treat noise as a potential signal—something to be measured, compared, and analyzed in its own right—we may begin to see patterns that point to entirely new domains of quantum behavior. The work has already begun, even if it has not yet been framed this way. What remains is to draw these threads together, test them more systematically, and ask more openly whether we are glimpsing a deeper structure inside the noise.

7. Theory That Supports This Hypothesis

The idea that emergent phenomena might arise from noisy quantum systems is not without theoretical grounding. In fact, several fields—including statistical physics, quantum information theory, complexity theory, and nonlinear

dynamics—offer frameworks that not only allow for such behavior but in some cases directly predict it. While most theoretical work in quantum computing focuses on idealized systems and fault-tolerant logic, there is a parallel literature, more focused on open systems and collective behavior, that provides tools for understanding how complexity can emerge under conditions that include noise, dissipation, and imperfect control.

In statistical physics, emergence is a central concept. Thermodynamic properties such as temperature, pressure, and entropy are not properties of individual particles, but of ensembles. These macroscopic properties arise from the collective behavior of many interacting components, and they become well-defined only in the thermodynamic limit. Crucially, statistical mechanics shows that randomness—thermal fluctuations, stochastic collisions—can lead to stable, predictable emergent laws. In quantum systems, this framework extends to phenomena like eigenstate thermalization, where subsystems evolve toward thermal equilibrium due to entanglement with the rest of the system. These ideas support the notion that quantum computers, especially as they grow in qubit count and interaction depth, may begin to display emergent thermodynamic-like behavior, even under the influence of noise.

Quantum information theory adds further structure. Concepts like entanglement entropy, mutual information, and channel capacity quantify how information is distributed and transformed in quantum systems. When applied to noisy systems, these tools reveal that noise does not simply destroy information—it reshapes it. In particular, noise can induce transitions in the informational structure of a system. Studies of decoherence channels, quantum error-correcting codes, and information scrambling show that systems can reorganize themselves under noise in ways that exhibit universal behavior, including transitions between ordered and disordered phases of entanglement. This supports the idea that noise can, under the right conditions, produce not just destruction of quantum coherence, but the emergence of new quantum correlations or stability patterns.

From complexity theory, we learn that systems with many degrees of freedom and local interactions often exhibit behavior that cannot be predicted from the

properties of their parts. Concepts such as self-organized criticality, percolation thresholds, and network attractors all describe forms of spontaneous order arising in high-dimensional systems with imperfect control. These models often rely on randomness or noise as a driving force, with critical points or tipping conditions emerging naturally from the internal dynamics. While these models are typically classical, they provide a template for understanding how similar behaviors could arise in quantum systems—particularly in quantum computers operating under imperfect conditions with many coupled elements and feedback pathways.

Finally, nonlinear dynamics provides a language for describing how small perturbations in a system can lead to large, organized changes over time. Systems governed by nonlinear differential equations often exhibit chaos, bifurcations, and attractor structures that represent emergent order. In quantum mechanics, nonlinear dynamics appear in mean-field approximations, semiclassical models, and certain open-system descriptions. In the context of noisy quantum processors, the effective dynamics of the system—including control pulses, decoherence, and crosstalk—may create feedback loops that function as nonlinear operators. If such loops are present, then it becomes reasonable to expect the emergence of structured dynamics, possibly stable or metastable patterns of entanglement and information flow that persist across time and even across device runs.

Importantly, none of these frameworks requires a perfect or noise-free system. On the contrary, many forms of emergence depend on noise—either as a source of fluctuation that allows the system to explore its state space or as a means of driving transitions between regimes. This is a critical shift in perspective: while reductionist approaches focus on suppressing or correcting noise, emergentist models treat noise as a potentially essential component of the system’s behavior.

There is also a growing body of work that connects these ideas more directly to quantum computing hardware. Studies of quantum spin chains, lattice models, and noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) devices show that complex behavior—including phase transitions, entanglement localization, and information scrambling—can occur under experimentally relevant conditions. These results do not just allow for the possibility of emergence in noisy quantum systems—they

suggest that we may already be seeing it, and simply interpreting it through the wrong lens.

In summary, theory does not rule out emergence in noisy quantum computers. In many models, it predicts it. The challenge is no longer whether such behavior is possible in principle, but whether we are ready to recognize it, study it systematically, and expand our models of quantum computing to include it.

8. How to Look for It

If emergent phenomena are present in the noise and artifacts of quantum computers, the first task is to develop methods that can detect them. These methods won't be the same as those used to verify gate fidelity or algorithmic correctness. Instead of assuming ideal behavior and subtracting error, this approach begins by accepting the system's behavior as-is, and asking whether any patterns arise within it. The goal is not to test whether the computer is functioning "correctly" by conventional standards, but to determine whether the system is expressing structure that is unexpected, nontrivial, and possibly universal.

One of the most direct ways to search for emergent behavior is through entanglement tracking. Entanglement is a central feature of quantum systems, and its structure can reveal whether a system is behaving in a correlated, collective way. While full entanglement entropy measurements are difficult to perform on large systems, partial measurements—such as mutual information between qubit pairs or small clusters—can reveal long-range correlations or nonlocal dependencies. In systems dominated by noise, these correlations would typically be short-lived and random. If instead they persist across time or reappear in different runs of the same experiment, this may indicate a form of spontaneous structure forming within the entanglement network.

Quantum state tomography offers a more complete but resource-intensive method. By performing a large number of measurements in different bases and reconstructing the density matrix of a system, it is possible to capture the full

quantum state of a small subsystem. When performed repeatedly across multiple trials, tomography can be used to search for unexpected stability or attractor states—regions of Hilbert space to which the system tends to return, even in the presence of decoherence. These attractors, if they exist, could serve as indicators of self-organizing behavior driven by noise and interaction.

Another approach is to use outlier statistics. In standard benchmarking, noise is treated as a distribution, and performance is evaluated based on average error or fidelity. But emergence may not show up in averages. It may appear in rare, statistically significant deviations from expected distributions—spikes in certain output states, unexpectedly high coherence in small subgroups, or temporal clustering of high-fidelity runs. Tracking the tails of distributions over time, and analyzing how these outliers evolve, could reveal hidden structures that are drowned out in bulk metrics. This method is especially useful when searching for metastable behavior or transient symmetry breaking, where the system temporarily settles into a new pattern before being driven back into noise.

Unsupervised machine learning offers a toolset that is well-suited to this kind of exploratory analysis. Algorithms such as clustering, dimensionality reduction, and anomaly detection can help identify patterns in high-dimensional data without requiring a specific hypothesis in advance. Applied to time-series data, raw measurement readouts, or tomographic reconstructions, these tools may uncover recurring motifs, hidden variables, or shifts in behavior that correspond to emergent regimes. The key is not to label the data in advance, but to let the system speak for itself—then ask whether the observed patterns are consistent with known physics or suggest something new.

A critical step in any such investigation is cross-platform comparison. If a pattern emerges in one device but not another, it may be due to specific hardware characteristics, calibration routines, or design features. But if similar behavior appears across different architectures—superconducting qubits, trapped ions, photonic systems—it strengthens the case that the behavior is not a quirk of one machine, but a reflection of deeper system dynamics. This requires collaborative

frameworks and standardized protocols for data collection, as well as agreement on what kinds of data are worth preserving and analyzing.

Repeatability is essential. Emergent phenomena, by definition, are not random—they may arise from stochastic conditions, but they lead to reproducible behavior once the system enters the right regime. The appearance of a particular entanglement pattern, output signature, or error distribution across multiple trials and timeframes provides a strong indicator that the system is not merely fluctuating, but expressing internal structure. Repeatable emergence also enables experimental refinement—small changes in input conditions, noise profiles, or gate sequences can be used to probe the stability and boundaries of the emergent state.

Together, these methods—entanglement analysis, tomography, outlier statistics, machine learning, cross-platform testing, and repeatability studies—form a toolkit for detecting emergence in noisy quantum systems. None of them guarantees discovery, but all are based on the premise that quantum systems may contain more structure than we currently assume. The shift required is not just technical, but conceptual: rather than correcting noise, we ask what it contains. Rather than seeking precision alone, we also look for pattern, regularity, and behavior that suggests the presence of a system responding to its own internal dynamics. If such behavior exists, it should be detectable. The tools are already here—we just have to begin using them differently.

9. What Could Go Wrong

The search for emergent phenomena in quantum noise is inherently speculative. While the potential upside is high—new physics, new computational paradigms, new insight into complexity—it also carries significant risk of misinterpretation. The idea that meaningful structure might arise from apparent noise opens the door to pattern recognition in high-dimensional, probabilistic data, where the human mind is notoriously prone to seeing what it wants to see. Without careful controls, rigorous statistical frameworks, and clear falsifiability, the same richness

that makes this area exciting can also lead to error, overclaiming, and false discovery.

One of the most immediate risks is the detection of false positives. In high-dimensional systems with large amounts of data, correlations and patterns will arise by chance alone. If one scans enough output distributions, post-selects favorable measurement windows, or focuses only on outlier events, it's easy to construct narratives around features that are statistically meaningless. This is especially true when experiments are not preregistered or when exploratory data analysis is treated as confirmatory. In such environments, the line between real emergent structure and coincidental alignment is thin—and easy to cross.

Another concern is interpretive bias. Researchers who are looking for emergent behavior may, consciously or unconsciously, frame their analysis in ways that amplify weak signals or fit data to theoretical expectations. This is not unique to quantum computing; it is a risk in any field working near the edge of current theory and instrumentation. But in quantum systems, where observables are probabilistic and sensitive to measurement basis, bias can influence not only data analysis but also the initial design of experiments and selection of which degrees of freedom are worth measuring. The more flexible the system, the easier it becomes to fit the data to multiple models—including ones that imply emergence where none exists.

There are also limits of resolution—both in terms of hardware and theory—that must be acknowledged. Most quantum computers today cannot perform full tomography on more than a handful of qubits. Entanglement structures, correlations, and noise dynamics are often inferred indirectly, and the fidelity of those inferences depends on gate calibration, readout precision, and assumptions built into the model. Emergent behavior, if it exists, may be subtle—distributed across time, space, and measurement channels in ways that are difficult to resolve. Without a high enough signal-to-noise ratio, it becomes difficult to distinguish real structure from transient statistical fluctuation.

Another danger lies in retrofitting—the practice of interpreting emergent behavior after the fact, based on data that was not originally collected for that purpose.

While exploratory analysis is a valid scientific technique, it must be clearly separated from confirmatory claims. If a novel pattern is found in a specific dataset, it must be tested on new data, under new conditions, to verify that it is a reproducible phenomenon rather than a context-specific artifact. In the absence of such replication, theories of emergence may be little more than artifacts of overfitting to a complex, under-constrained system.

There is also a deeper conceptual issue: emergence is not easy to define. In many cases, it's unclear whether a given phenomenon is truly emergent—meaning irreducible to local dynamics—or merely the result of complex but ultimately tractable behavior. Quantum systems are already non-intuitive, and what appears to be emergent may be explainable through refined models of decoherence, noise propagation, or control error. Without a clear criterion for emergence—something operational, measurable, and falsifiable—it becomes difficult to distinguish new physics from poorly understood conventional behavior.

So how can these risks be managed? First, by adopting strong statistical safeguards. Any observed structure must be evaluated against null models, simulated noise baselines, and randomized controls. If a pattern arises, it must do so with statistical significance across independent trials, and ideally across different hardware platforms. Second, by maintaining a clear separation between exploratory and confirmatory analysis, ensuring that hypotheses about emergent behavior are tested in new experiments with different parameters. Third, by fostering transparency and replication, making raw data and analysis code openly available, so that other researchers can test and challenge findings.

Finally, it is important to maintain intellectual discipline—to remember that while the hypothesis is exciting, the default explanation for unexpected behavior in a noisy quantum system is still noise. Emergence, if it is there, must not just be possible but necessary—able to explain observations that no other framework can. This requires patience, skepticism, and a willingness to abandon the hypothesis if the evidence does not hold.

In short, the search for emergent quantum behavior in noise must be conducted with the same rigor that governs any search for new physics. The difference is that

in this case, the signal is buried not in cleaner data, but in the patterns that remain after error correction fails. Finding those patterns may change how we understand quantum systems—but only if we can first tell what is real and what is illusion.

10. Why It Matters

The idea that emergent phenomena might arise within the noise of quantum computers is not just a technical curiosity—it has deep implications across physics, computing, and philosophy. If it turns out that noisy quantum systems are not simply failing to perform ideal operations, but are instead settling into novel forms of organization, then we are standing at the edge of a different kind of discovery. At stake is not only the validation of a scientific hypothesis, but the possibility of opening up a new frontier in our understanding of complex quantum matter—and perhaps, a new way to compute altogether.

From a physics standpoint, the discovery of emergent behavior in noisy quantum systems would force a reassessment of what counts as a quantum phase, a quantum process, or even a quantum system. Current models assume that noise is an external influence—a disruption imposed on otherwise well-understood dynamics. But if noise itself can drive the formation of structure, then we must consider that some systems only become fully physical when they include their imperfections. This mirrors earlier shifts in physics, where interactions once treated as nuisance terms—thermal fluctuations, dissipation, chaos—were later found to be essential to the full behavior of the system. Quantum computing may now be facing a similar shift. We may need to look not just at isolated gate fidelity, but at the full statistical and dynamical profile of the device as a complex, open system.

The implications for quantum computing itself are equally significant. The current paradigm assumes that high fidelity, isolation, and perfect control are prerequisites for useful computation. If emergent computation can arise under noisy conditions—if, for example, the system can settle into low-error or pattern-

generating states on its own—then a new class of devices becomes viable. Instead of building increasingly delicate machines that fight against noise, we could begin designing machines that work with it. This is not an unfamiliar idea in other domains: analog computing, neuromorphic systems, and certain types of biological computation all function in high-noise environments by exploiting redundancy, feedback, and self-organization. The same may eventually be true of quantum computing, where certain tasks—especially pattern recognition, classification, or simulation of open quantum systems—may be better suited to emergent, complexity-based approaches than to logic-gate precision.

At a deeper level, this also touches on our understanding of quantum matter itself. Quantum computing has provided a new way to probe the structure of entanglement, information flow, and decoherence—processes that, while long known in theory, are only now being observed and manipulated in real-time. If new forms of order arise in these systems—not due to intentional programming but due to the internal physics of the machine—then we are witnessing the emergence of a new class of quantum materials. These materials are defined not by their chemical composition, but by their behavior under sustained drive and dissipation. They are built not from atoms, but from rules of interaction and control, tuned by software but shaped by physical feedback. This would be a new form of matter—dynamic, algorithmic, and deeply quantum.

Finally, there is a philosophical shift implicit in this perspective. For decades, the goal of quantum technology has been to impose control: to tame decoherence, suppress noise, and force the system into desired states. This remains a valid and valuable goal. But emergence suggests another path—one in which we do not control the system entirely, but instead learn from how it behaves under imperfect conditions. In this view, the machine is not just a calculator but a physical system to be studied in its own right, like a fluid, a crystal, or a living cell. The aim is not to eliminate its complexity, but to understand what that complexity is trying to say. If we accept this, then quantum computers become not only tools of computation, but tools of discovery—experimental platforms for uncovering new rules, new states, and possibly new laws of nature.

In that sense, what's at stake is not just better performance or deeper insight into a particular device. What's at stake is a broader vision of science itself—one in which control and observation, precision and complexity, logic and emergence, are no longer seen as opposites, but as complementary ways of engaging with the physical world.

11. Next Steps and Open Questions

If we take seriously the hypothesis that quantum noise might harbor emergent behavior, then the next step is to design experiments that can test this idea in a falsifiable way. The challenge is not just to observe patterns in noise—those are easy to find—but to determine whether these patterns reflect underlying physics that cannot be reduced to known noise models or hardware artifacts. This means developing a new kind of experimental protocol: one that does not assume ideal behavior and subtract error, but instead accepts noise as the raw material of the system and asks what forms it can take under repeated, uncontrolled, or minimally controlled evolution.

A first class of experiments would focus on reproducibility. Emergent behavior, even if noisy or metastable, should produce patterns that are statistically robust across repeated runs. These might include recurring clusters in output state distributions, stable entanglement substructures, or consistent mutual information patterns in subsets of qubits. Such experiments could begin with existing hardware: superconducting devices, trapped-ion systems, and quantum annealers already produce large volumes of measurement data that could be analyzed for repeatable structure beyond what's expected from hardware models. Running the same random circuits thousands of times across different days, conditions, or hardware generations could begin to reveal whether emergent features persist or shift in a coherent way.

A second direction involves controlled perturbations. Emergent systems are often sensitive to small changes in boundary conditions, drive parameters, or initial states. This sensitivity can be used as a probe. By introducing small, systematic

changes to input circuits or environmental variables, and monitoring how the system's statistical behavior responds, researchers can map out phase-like behavior: regions of parameter space where the system transitions between different dynamical regimes. If such transitions are sharp, reproducible, and accompanied by changes in internal correlations, this may suggest that the system is exploring different emergent attractors, not merely drifting through noise.

Third, there is a strong case for theoretical-experimental collaboration across disciplines. Complexity theorists and statistical physicists bring tools and perspectives that are rarely applied to quantum hardware: percolation theory, attractor dynamics, network entropy, and emergent computation models. These tools can help design metrics and interpret signatures that might otherwise be misclassified as noise. Machine learning researchers, meanwhile, can assist in developing unsupervised methods to detect structure in high-dimensional measurement datasets—methods that avoid overfitting by grounding their models in physical constraints. To fully explore this territory, collaborative teams that span quantum physics, complexity science, and data science will be needed, both to interpret data and to formalize what counts as emergence in the quantum context.

A more ambitious frontier involves purpose-built systems: hardware and software designed not to suppress noise but to explore it. These systems would aim to maximize complexity, nonlinearity, and internal coupling rather than isolate qubits and minimize error. This is a conceptual shift—from trying to make the system transparent to noise, to making it sensitive to emergent structure. In such systems, analog quantum simulators or network-like architectures may be more appropriate than traditional gate-based designs. Open problems here include determining the minimal architecture capable of exhibiting emergent behavior, and whether such systems can perform useful computation—or even computation that is not possible by conventional means.

Several specific open questions could be addressed in the near term:

- Can entanglement clusters or long-range mutual information patterns form spontaneously in noisy, uncalibrated systems—and if so, under what conditions?
- Are there identifiable phase transitions in the statistical behavior of quantum devices as noise levels or circuit complexity are tuned?
- Does output data from certain quantum circuits show signs of low-dimensional attractor dynamics when analyzed over time?
- Can quantum reservoir computing systems be made more powerful or more stable by exploiting, rather than suppressing, internal noise?
- Are there universal signatures—such as scaling laws, critical exponents, or entropy bounds—that mark the boundary between noise-dominated and emergence-dominated regimes?

These questions are testable. They don't require hypothetical particles or unreachable energy scales. They only require careful observation of the machines we already have—and a willingness to interpret those machines not just as imperfect computers, but as physical systems in their own right, evolving under rules we do not yet fully understand.

The short-term goal is to develop diagnostics—both theoretical and experimental—that can identify candidate emergent behavior with minimal assumptions. The long-term goal is to discover whether these behaviors are harnessable, generalizable, and ultimately explainable within or beyond the existing framework of quantum mechanics. The answers may redefine how we think about computation, noise, and complexity itself.

12. Conclusion

This paper has argued that the noise and artifacts present in today's quantum computers may represent more than technical imperfections—they may be the

early signs of something deeper. Instead of treating noise as an obstacle to be eliminated, we have explored the possibility that under certain conditions, noise may become a medium through which emergent quantum phenomena arise. These conditions—nonlinearity, many-body interaction, entanglement, and far-from-equilibrium dynamics—are already present in existing hardware. The behaviors we associate with emergence in other domains may be occurring in quantum systems as well, not in the abstract, but right now, embedded within the statistical irregularities of real devices.

The case for this perspective rests on several pillars. Historically, physics has often progressed by reinterpreting noise, error, or anomaly as the first clue to new structure—superconductivity, chaos, and the quantum Hall effect all began this way. Theoretically, our current models do not rule out emergence under noisy conditions; in many regimes, they predict it. Experimentally, there are growing indications—from thermalization behavior to reservoir computing—that real quantum devices may already be operating in regimes where new dynamics are beginning to surface. And methodologically, we now have the tools—entanglement tracking, machine learning, statistical analysis—to detect and explore these dynamics with a level of resolution that was not available even a few years ago.

More broadly, this is a proposal to shift how we look at quantum hardware. Not merely as machines that fail to meet ideal performance benchmarks, but as complex physical systems in their own right. Machines that evolve, adapt, and generate behavior under conditions that were never fully controlled—and may never need to be. This is not a rejection of precision quantum computing, but an expansion of its purpose. Alongside the path toward fault-tolerant gates and clean logical operations, there may be a second path—one that explores the behaviors that quantum systems naturally express when they are left imperfect, noisy, and interconnected.

In this view, the frontier of quantum physics is not waiting in a new particle or force. It may already be here, embedded in the systems we've already built, operating just beyond our current threshold of recognition. What we call “noise”

may in some cases be signal. What we dismiss as error may be order of a different kind. The task now is not to eliminate the noise, but to listen to it. To let the machines speak for themselves—not only to compute, but to reveal.

References

1. Preskill, J. (2018). *Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond*. Quantum, 2, 79. <https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2018-08-06-79>
2. Harrow, A. W., & Montanaro, A. (2017). *Quantum computational supremacy*. Nature, 549(7671), 203–209. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23458>
3. Deutsch, J. M. (1991). *Quantum statistical mechanics in a closed system*. Physical Review A, 43(4), 2046–2049. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.43.2046>
4. D'Alessio, L., Kafri, Y., Polkovnikov, A., & Rigol, M. (2016). *From quantum chaos and eigenstate thermalization to statistical mechanics and thermodynamics*. Advances in Physics, 65(3), 239–362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00018732.2016.1198134>
5. Tanaka, G., Yamane, T., Héroux, J. B., Nakane, R., Kanazawa, N., Takeda, S., ... & Nakano, D. (2019). *Recent advances in physical reservoir computing: A review*. Neural Networks, 115, 100–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2019.03.005>
6. Albash, T., & Lidar, D. A. (2018). *Adiabatic quantum computation and quantum annealing: Theory and practice*. Reviews of Modern Physics, 90(1), 015002. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.90.015002>
7. Baez, J. C. (2001). *Quantum quandaries: A category-theoretic perspective*. In S. French, D. Rickles, & J. Saatsi (Eds.), *The Structural Foundations of Quantum Gravity*.
8. Goold, J., Huber, M., Riera, A., del Rio, L., & Skrzypczyk, P. (2016). *The role of quantum information in thermodynamics—A topical review*. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical, 49(14), 143001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/49/14/143001>

9. Roushan, P., et al. (2017). *Spectroscopic signatures of localization with interacting photons in superconducting qubits*. Science, 358(6367), 1175–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao1401>
10. Cirac, J. I., & Zoller, P. (2012). *Goals and opportunities in quantum simulation*. Nature Physics, 8(4), 264–266. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys2275>
11. Lloyd, S. (2000). *Ultimate physical limits to computation*. Nature, 406(6799), 1047–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35023282>
12. Lin, H. Q., & Gubernatis, J. E. (1993). *Exact diagonalization methods for quantum systems*. Computers in Physics, 7(4), 400–407. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4823125>
13. Yamamoto, N., et al. (2023). *Dynamic thermalization on noisy quantum hardware*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.04770. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.04770>
14. Nguyen, D., et al. (2024). *Diffusion-inspired quantum noise mitigation in parameterized quantum circuits*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00843. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00843>
15. Hartmann, M. J., & Plenio, M. B. (2008). *Quantum many-body phenomena in coupled cavity arrays*. Laser & Photonics Reviews, 2(6), 527–556. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lpor.200810046>

**Will We Discover
Exotic Physics and
Emergent Phenomena
in the 'Noise and Artifacts'
of Quantum Computers?**